



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,383	09/04/2001	Necmettin Can	GAP0001-US	1273
28970	7590	07/06/2006	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP			CUFF, MICHAEL A	
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings' objection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 35 and 37 recite a step of subtracting, which is not disclosed in the specification. On page 11 of applicant's arguments, applicant asserts that such disclosure (paragraph 0028) encompasses the subtracting recited in amended claims. The examiner does not concur. The specification does not disclose subtraction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35-37, 48 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of DeTemple et al.

Suzuki shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying using the RF tags to determine their locations on a sales floor and correlating garments taken into the fitting room with their store location.

Suzuki shows, figure 9, a system and method for tracking and recognizing merchandise items (garments) taken into a fitting room by a customer for providing more efficient customer assistance. Each merchandise item is attached to a wireless tag (RFID) including a product identifier. A fitting room is equipped with an antenna/receiver unit, which interrogates the wireless tag of an item taken into the fitting room to be tried-on. A store server (capable of displaying as much as applicant's disclosure) retrieves information about the item based on the product identifier, and presents such information to a store clerk through an in-store terminal. In addition, the server develops recommendation of other products that the customer might be interested based upon the items taken into the fitting room. The server includes an analysis (determining) and recommendation (reporting, displaying) engine that analyses the style, color, and brand of each of the items in the fitting room, and develops

recommendations accordingly. Figure 9 show a trial history including tried and purchased or not purchased data (correlation). Suzuki shows a relationship in as much as applicant does.

Issacman et al. teaches a method of using RFID tags to automatically and rapidly locating and tracking objects throughout a facility (using the RF tags to determine their locations) in order to be able to use the object's location information.

Based on the teaching of Issacman et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Suzuki database to include the Issacman tracking system locations in order to be able to use the object's location information.

DeTemple et al. teaches a remote electronic information display system for a retail facility. Data is collected on the customer location, product location, price and customer demographics. From column 9, line 44-46, data can be manipulated and sorted as a function of price, product location, advertising, customer demographics, store and product location, environment, etc. (correlating products with their store location) in order to understand customer behavior and increase sales.

Based on the teaching of DeTemple et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Suzuki database to include the DeTemple data manipulation, including correlating products with their store location, in order to understand customer behavior and increase sales.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed are moot based on the new rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3627

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Michael Cuff
June 21, 2006